

Remarks

The specification stands objected to as a result of the lack of headings. The Applicants have accordingly amended the specification to include headings and to make a number of other minor changes to place the application into better form for allowance. A clean abstract is attached. Entry into the official file and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The claims stand objected to because they include reference characters. The Applicants have accordingly amended Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 to remove such reference characters. Claim 1 has also been amended in several locations with respect to antecedent bases. Entry of the changes into the official file and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Yoshida. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comment hypothetically applying Yoshida against the claims. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Yoshida fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose all of the Applicants' claimed subject matter. Details are set forth below.

Referring to Fig. 6 of Yoshida as mentioned in the rejection, Yoshida discloses a structure that comprises a sputtering layer on a coating layer on a substrate film. More specifically, the Yoshida construction in Fig. 6 includes a substrate 10. A lower surface of the substrate 10 has a smoothed layer 40 and an opposed upper surface has protrusion layer 100. A reflection layer 20 is applied on the exposed surface of the protrusion layer whereby the protrusion layer 100 is sandwiched between the substrate 10 and the reflection layer 20. Particles 30 are on the exposed surface of the reflection layer 20.

This is sharply contrasted to the Applicants' claims, as illustrated by the Applicants' Fig. 1. The Applicants' reflector has a structure that is a ridge-shaped uneven shape and a reinforcing material. The reinforcing material connects bottom parts of concave parts with each other from the backside of the side of the one surface of the reflected material to reinforce the uneven shape.

The Applicants respectfully submit this structure is sharply different from that disclosed by Yoshida. For example, the Applicants claim a reflective material and a reinforcing material wherein the reinforcing material connects to the reflective material. That is not the case in Yoshida. Instead, the reflection layer 20 of Yoshida connects to a protrusion layer 100 and not the substrate 10 of Yoshida. In other words, there is a layer intervening between the reflection layer and the substrate (or reinforcing material in the Applicants' claims). In the Applicants' claimed structure, the

reinforcing material connects to the reflective material and not an intervening protrusion layer 100 as is the case in Yoshida. This is thus a fundamental difference between Yoshida and the Applicants' claims. This is true because the Applicants' reflective layer is not the sputtering layer or protrusion layer 100 of Yoshida which connects to the underlining substrate 10 which would be comparable to the Applicants' reinforcing material. The Applicants respectfully submit that this represents a fundamental difference in the construction of the Yoshida device relative to the Applicants' claimed subject matter. As a consequence, the Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshida is inapplicable to Claims 1-11. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vbm
(215) 656-3381